Three Dissenters on the New Arms Budget, P. 3

A Warning Nixon Did Not Heed

"If the Cambodian war accelerates, we are witnessing the destruction of the American economic system as we know it. It will never be the same.—*Banker Pierre Rinfret at a National Bank of Washington economic outlook luncheon April 29. He was one of five economists who met with Nixon two days before.*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVIII, NO. 10 MAY 18, 1970 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Only the Bums Can Save the Country Now

The race is on between protest and disaster. Despite the first four martyr "bums" of Nixon-Agnewism at Kent State, the college shutdown their deaths precipitated, the outpouring of student and other protesters here last week-end, the campus lobbyists beginning to flood the halls of Congress, the Senate resolutions to limit or end Indochinese military operations, and the smoldering near revolt within the Nixon Administration itself, we are still on the brink. We are in the first stages of a new and wider war from which withdrawal will be difficult. The military hold the reins and can precipitate new provocations and stage new alarms. The only hope is that the students can create such a Plague for Peace, swarming like locusts into the halls of Congress, that they stop all other business and make an end to the war the No. 1 concern it ought to be. Washington must no longer be the privileged sanctuary of the warmakers. The slogan of the striking students ought to be: Suspend Classes and Educate the Country. I see no other visible and adequate means to stop the slide into a conflict that may sweep very suddenly beyond the confines of Indochina if the man who gambled on Cambodia ends by gambling on the use of nuclear weapons.

The Unwilling Led By The Unqualified

In a dispatch from a landing zone in Cambodia, Jack Foisie of the *Washington Post* (May 8) described GIs jumping from helicopters under enemy fire with derisive denunciations of the war scrawled on their helmets. One of those he copied down sums up the situation of the whole country in this war. "We are the unwilling," it said, "led by the unqualified, doing the unnecessary, for the ungrateful." As usual the country is not being told the truth about why we went into Cambodia. In his war address of April 30 Nixon pictured the attack across the border as a pre-emptive exercise to hit an "enemy building up to launch massive attacks on our forces and those of South Vietnam." It was described as a swift preventive action from which we would soon withdraw and which was not part of any broader intervention in Cambodian affairs.

But thanks to the indiscretion of one Congressman, we now have the private—and more candid—version given members of Congress at special State Department briefings. This puts the origins and purpose of the Cambodian action in a very different light. The Congressman is Rep. Hamilton Fish *(R. N.Y.)*, a right-winger who has long questioned the logic of our heavy commitment in so peripheral an area as Southeast Asia. In a letter to constituents released May 13, Mr. Fish summarizes a private briefing by Under Secretary of State Richardson for selected members of Congress. Nixon said we moved across the border to nip enemy plans for an imminent attack. But from Richardson's briefing, Mr. Fish reports, "It was clear that the present military thrust into Cambodia hinged largely on the reportedly surprise overthrow of Prince Sihanouk." Nixon said in his April 30 speech that for five years "neither the U.S. nor South Vietnam moved against those enemy sanctuaries because we did not wish to violate the territory of a neutral nation." But Richardson gave the Congressmen a different story. He told them "U.S. intelligence had known for years of those enclaves from which attacks on South Vietnam have been launched" but we had never attacked them before "because it was feared that Sihanouk would counter any invasion by allowing NVA [North Vietnamese Army] forces to enlarge their occupied areas."

Sihanouk was trying to maintain a precarious neutrality by playing one side against the other. Nixon was deceitful when he said in the April 30 speech that our policy since the Geneva conference of 1954 "has been to scrupulously respect the neutrality of the Cambodian people" and adding—as proof of our virtue—that since last August we have had a diplomatic mission in Pnom Penh "of fewer than 15" and that for the previous four years "we did not have any diplomatic mission whatever." The truth is that Sihanouk ousted our mission and broke relations in 1965 because he claimed the CIA had been plotting against him for years and even tried twice to kill him. Sihanouk was especially resentful of the Khmer Serei (Free Khmer) mercenaries the CIA and our Special Forces had enlisted from among Cambodians living in South Vietnam and Thailand to act as an anti-Sihanouk commando force. The CIA gave it facilities to broadcast anti-Sihanouk propaganda from Saigon.

"For the past five years," Nixon said with bland hypocrisy, "we have provided no military assistance and no economic assistance whatever to Cambodia." He did not explain that Sihanouk threw out our military mission because he said it had

(Continued on Page Two)

The Blood on Nixon's Hands and Agnew's

The murder of four young students at Kent State University last night by units of the National Guard is in a way the direct responsibility of the President of the United States. . . . The President did not order this action directly, but the temper of administration statements, the tone of its attacks on dissent, the demeaning of the office of the Presidency by its present holder led to it. The characterization of dissenters as "bums" has polarized our people. The President has attempted to cut off the students from the country, to stifle their cry by ridicule and scorn. The illogical extension of this attempt to silence dissent is death, and that is what occurred at Kent State yesterday.

—*Rep. Cohelan* (D. Cal.), *May 5 Cong. Record.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

been trying to turn his armed forces against him, and gave up economic aid, too, rather than have it used as a cover for U.S. agents trying to overthrow him. This was not a figment of Sihanouk's imagination. As far back as 1958, in a police raid on the villa of one of his Generals, Sihanouk found a letter from President Eisenhower pledging full support to a projected coup and to a reversal of Cambodian neutrality. This was part of a "Bangkok plan" worked out between the dictators of South Vietnam and Thailand (Diem and Marshal Sarit Thanarit) to dismember Cambodia and instigate civil war (see Wm. Worthy's account in the *York, Pa., Gazette & Daily* of April 30). When Sihanouk resumed relations last August, in his desperate see-saw between the two sides, his condition was that the U.S. mission be kept small. He didn't want too many CIA agents roaming around.

The CIA's Trojan Horse

That was poor Sihanouk's mistake. Cambodian neutrality was ended when the military we had long wooed finally overthrew Sihanouk on March 18. The most complete account yet published of the events leading up to the coup is to be found in *Le Monde Diplomatique* for April. It is by Daniel Roy, a Frenchman with 15 years' experience in Indochina who was for a time press attache to Prince Sihanouk. He claims that funds for the coup were provided by a Cambodian adventurer turned banker in Bangkok who was associated in the enterprise with the notorious Son Ngoc Thanh, puppet President of Cambodia under the Japanese occupation. The latter fled to Thailand after the war and according to M. Roy is "today in the service of the CIA." M. Roy also charges that the coup was prepared by Khmer Serei forces who went over the border with their arms and wives and pretended that they were defecting to Sihanouk. They infiltrated the army and the police as a Trojan Horse for the CIA.

Let us now return to Congressman Fish's account of the private State Department briefing. "Following the fall of Sihanouk," the Congressmen were told, "the new anti-Communist government cut all supply lines [of the NVA and Viet Cong] except the Ho Chi Minh trail" which, of course, lies largely outside Cambodian territory. *"To re-secure their severed supply routes,"* the account in the private briefing continued, *"VA and NVA began moving out of the enclaves, thereby threatening the overthrow of the Cambodian government."* [Our italics]. It is "against this background," Rep. Fish's account of the briefing concludes, "that the American-South Vietnamese strikes into Cambodia were ordered."

The sequence is quite different from that given publicly by Mr. Nixon. Instead of preparing an attack on our forces in South Vietnam, the enemy was reacting to an attack on its supply lines. This upset the status quo, and risked a complete take-over of Cambodia by the other side. We intervened to save it from the consequences. Did our government give the new Lon Nol government of Cambodia assurances that we would defend it if its action in cutting all the supply routes precipitated an attack upon it?

What If Sihanouk Regains Power?

It is true that at the State Department briefing "it was stressed that the present attacks were not aimed at either the confrontation of the estimated 40 to 50,000 VC and NVA believed operating in Cambodia or the defense of the present government of Cambodia. The raids were described as strictly 'spoiling actions', aimed at supply, bunker and communication network destruction" and to give the South Vietnamese army additional time while the enemy rebuilds its supplies. But you have to be pretty feeble-minded to accept this at face value. What if Sihanouk, with NVA and Peking support, is restored to power, this time not as a precarious neutral but as an ally of the other side? What if we are then faced with the prospect, not just of restoring the old supply lines and bases but of Cambodia turning into one big enemy base? Who can believe that the Nixon administration will stand by and let this happen?

This is the wider war which lies ahead. The overthrow of Sihanouk was a grave political mistake. It gave the other side a new ally with legitimacy and mass support, basic necessities for the Indochinese Peoples War which has already been proclaimed against us. The situation inside Cambodia was succinctly summed up in an interview which the pro-Nixon and pro-war *U.S. News & World Report* for May 18 held by cable with its correspondent, James N. Wallace, in Pnom-Penh:

Q. Have the allied attacks in Eastern Cambodia saved the rest of the country from a Communist take-over?

A. No. Unless the allied drive completely overwhelms the Communists, Cambodia's position remains about the same . . . the short-run result is even more chaos and

Too Godless To Be Good Killers?

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, a 41-year Navy veteran and chairman-designate of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said yesterday that "an atheist could not be as great a military leader as one who is not an atheist." Moorer's remarks came during his day-long testimony at U.S. District Court here in support of the policy of compulsory chapel attendance at West Point, Annapolis and the Air Force Academy.

Lacing his testimony with paeans to the military-instilled virtues of loyalty, integrity and leadership, Moorer also declared: "I don't think you will find an atheist who has reached the peak in the Armed Forces."

—Peter Osnos, Washington Post, April 29.

Lincoln Gordon Takes A Run-Out Powder When The Truth Catches Up With Him On Brazil

Dr. Lincoln Gordon, president of Johns Hopkins University, was sharply criticized yesterday by a former Brazilian congressman for his alleged role in the ouster of Brazilian President Joao Goulart in 1964, while Dr. Gordon was ambassador to Brazil. Marcio Moreira Alves, delivering a lecture at the Hopkins yesterday.

Mr. Alves said that American Embassy officials met with conspirators of the coup several days before the takeover and were quick to assure them the United States would support their government. . . . In keeping with their promises to the military, the United States recognized the new government immediately, even before it had taken full control of the government, Mr. Alves said. "Dr. Gordon had ample opportunities to denounce the torture in Brazil but did not profit by them," Mr. Alves said. He pointed out that Dr. Gordon stated 17 months after the coup that "this government represents the ideal government in view of the Alliance For Progress." . . .

Mr. Alves said the regime has become nothing more than a puppet government of the United States "much like the Diem regime in South Vietnam."

A table was set up on the stage in Shriver Hall, where Mr. Alves spoke, with two chairs and microphones in the hope that Dr. Gordon would come and debate with him. Dr. Gordon was offered an invitation to talk on several occasions, and had stated several times that he would discuss the Brazilian issue at any time, but he did not show up.

—Baltimore Sun, April 23.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confusion . . .

Q. Did the Cambodians welcome the Allied move?

A. Again, No. Cambodians do not like . . . the idea of South Vietnamese troops' rolling across Cambodia . . .

Q. What kind of reception would Sihonouk get?

A. Almost certainly he would receive more popular support than the Lon Nol government cares to admit. Sihanouk still is popular among a great many of Cambodia's 5.5 million peasants, who respected his traditional status as a god-king and liked his earthy personal relations with villagers.

Even If Nixon Wants To Withdraw

The French journalist, Max Clos, who has been covering Indochina for years during both the French and U.S. wars, foresees (in *Le Figaro* May 2-3) a Cambodian resistance based on peasant support, doing in their country what the Viet Cong have done in Vietnam and creating a "liberated zone" from which in time they will be able to take over Pnom Penh. "Mr. Nixon," M. Clos wrote, "hopes to withdraw his troops from Cambodia in a month and a half. Even if he succeeds, it is safe to predict he will have to send them back again."

The political folly of our latest move is not limited to Cambodia. The newly enlarged war must add to the shaky character of the Thieu regime, which has had to close down all the South Vietnamese schools in a rising student revolt much like our own. The idea of South Vietnamese troops being used to bolster a government which has been massacring Cambodian citizens of Vietnamese origin must add to Thieu's unpopularity. The bitterness between the Viets and the Khmers of Cambodia is incomparably older and more bitter than the recent animosities of the Russo-American cold war. It is only two centuries since the Viets seized the Mekong delta from the Khmers. Sihanouk, unlike his successors, never stirred up the mob against the Vietnamese, and the VC and NVA intruders, unlike our forces, did not bomb and devastate Cambodian villages. This new shift strengthens the forces opposing our puppets on both sides.

Yet Another Operation Total Victory

This has been a political war from its very beginning against the French. We go on believing as they did that a political problem can be solved by military means. The annals of their war, like ours, is full of sensationally billed search-and-destroy operations which were finally going to cripple the rebels, like this latest "Operation Total Victory" across the Cambodian border. The Communists under Ho Chi Minh seized national leadership in the war against the French, as the adroit Sihanouk did in Cambodia. Now they both are allied against us. Sihanouk will now make it possible for the other side to implement the basic strategy of a People's war on a wider scale. The strategy is to force maximum dispersion upon the hated foreign invader to make him widen the area of his activity and stretch his lines of communication so that the guerrillas can pick and choose the most advantageous weak points for their concentrated attacks. We have picked up their treacherous gambit by invading Cambodia and sooner or later unless we get out of Indochina altogether, we must send ground troops into Laos and Cambodia, perhaps even into North Vietnam where a fresh army of 250,000 or more awaits our landing. Nowhere has airpower, however overwhelming and unchallenged, been able to win a war.

What will happen when the country wakes up to find that instead of withdrawing troops we are going to send in fresh divisions? What happens to inflation, the budget and the stock market? To student and racial unrest? Nixon, in a mood of self-pity, complained in his April 30 address that past war Presidents did not have to face a nation "assailed by counsels of doubt and defeat from some of the most widely known opinion leaders of the nation." He seems to attribute this to some perversity. He takes it as personal. He does not

(Continued on Page Four)

The Hot Air About Pollution

I'm sick and tired of all the platitudes about pollution. The hot air from the politicians is a lot worse than the hydrocarbons from the automobiles. . . . The fact is, there simply is not going to be any major Federal effort to clean up the environment—no matter what anyone tells you—until the war in Vietnam comes to an end. The Nixon administration is not about to commit billions of dollars to clear the air as long as they continue to pour billions down the rathole of Vietnam. . . . America's most precious resource is not its trees, not its mountains, not even its water. America's most precious resource is its young men—the young men who are dying in Vietnam simply because most of the politicians at home don't care enough to force an end to this stupid war. Frankly, the 200 American boys who died in Vietnam last week don't care any more whether the air is dirty or clean.

—Rep. Brown (D. Cal.), *Earth Day speech at UCLA.*

Three Dissenters Protest The Waste And The ABM-Navy Deal In The New Arms Budget

At a time when the very air we breathe is becoming unfit to sustain life, H.R. 17123 authorizes the Air Force to develop prototypes of a new bomber at a currently estimated cost of $23.3 billion—for 5 planes.

At a time when budgetary limitations have been used to justify inaction not only on air and water pollution, but on our schools and slums, cities and crime, drugs and dropouts, it provides a slush-fund of $200 million from the Air Force to one corporation—money which the Air Force says is not owed to the corporation. At a time when the twin realities of inflation and depression are rampant in the land, it squanders over $1 billion in deploying and enlarging our presently authorized 2-site ABM system to 8 sites against a possible threat.

There is only $100 million in this bill for the new strategic bomber to be designated the B-1. It is in the money earmarked for Research and Development for the Air Force. With this authorization, however, the Air Force has advised us that it will enter into a contract to build just 5 prototypes of a new bomber at a cost they now estimate at $2.33 billion, or almost a half-billion each.

The last time we went this route was fairly recently, and then the bomber was called the B-70. We built two prototypes and half of a third one. The 2½ planes cost the taxpayers $1½ billion. One crashed, one is in the Air Force Museum at Wright-Patterson Field, and no one is quite sure where the pieces of the half are.

Two years ago the Administration requested $1.7 billion for naval ship construction and conversion. The House authorized only $1.4 billion for that purpose and Congress appropriated only $821 million. . . . This year the administration requested the sum of $2,728 million for ship construction. The Committee added the sum of $435 million. Rather than hearing that the Administration opposed this increase, we hear this year that a deal has been made which might be loosely described as: "You support my ship increase, I'll support your ABM increase."

—Minority view of Pike (D. N.Y.), *Nedzi* (D. Mich.) *and Whalen* (R. Ohio) *in House Armed Services report on the Fiscal 1971 Defense Authorization bill April 24.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nixon Hints At Goldwater-LeMay Style Bombing Tactics

(Continued from Page Three)

stop to consider why this war has aroused so much more opposition than any past war, and done so in every class and every region and every age-group, from Wall Street financiers to campus radicals. Even National Guardsmen give the V-sign to students, and soldiers go into battle with peace amulets around their necks. He seems to think there is something wrong with the critics. He will not face up to the possibility that there is something wrong with the war. Certainly this generation of Americans would prove no less patriotic and brave than any other if our country were really in danger.

COSVN Moved To Vietnam In April

It is a measure of our stupid leadership that the Cambodian war was started on the phoney pretext that just across the border was a kind of enemy Pentagon and that we could cripple the enemy by smashing it. One measure of the mendacity may be found in an intelligence briefing the *New York Times* reported April 4, two weeks after Sihanouk's overthrow. It said COSVN, the enemy HQ, had been moved from Cambodian to South Vietnamese territory. The story even carried a map showing the old location at Mimot—which figures in recent accounts of the Cambodian operation—in the "fish-hook" and the new location in a thick jungle area described as "virtually inaccessible to ground troops" and "probably not seriously vulnerable to air attacks." It is difficult to believe that Nixon and his aides are such idiots as not to be aware of this intelligence information.

The Eichmann trial taught the world the banality of evil. Nixon is teaching the world the evil of banality. The man so foolish as to talk to protesting students about football and surfing is the same man who (like Johnson) sees war in the puerile terms of "humiliation" and a challenge to his virility. He doesn't want us to be a "helpless giant" (which we are in Indochina) so he is plunging us into a wider quagmire where we will end up more helpless than ever.

The past week is the week in which the Nixon Administration began to come apart. Letters like Hickel's showed how isolated he is even from members of his own Cabinet where there seems to be a silent majority against him. The anti-war round robin signed by more than 200 employes of the State Department shows how deeply the Cambodian affair has stirred even the most timid, conformist and conventional section of the bureaucracy. Nothing Nixon says can be taken at face value. Even when he said on April 20, in his troop withdrawal announcement, that a "just peace" was at last in sight, he must have been planning this expansion of the war. Indeed General Westmoreland as Army Chief of Staff had already begun to lobby for a Cambodian invasion in off-the-record briefings.

There were two remarks of the deepest significance in the Nixon press conference of April 30. One was that if we withdraw from Vietnam "America is finished insofar as a peace-keeper in the Asian world is concerned." This revealed that he is still committed, despite that vague "low posture" talk on Guam, to a Pax Americana in Asia. If we are to police Asia we are in for many years of war and internal disruption. The folly is as great as if China were to try and become the "Peace-keeper" of Latin America. The other remark was that unlike Johnson he would not escalate step by step but "move decisively." This is the Goldwater-LeMay thesis that we could have won the Vietnam war if we had smashed Hanoi and Haiphong in one great blow, perhaps with nuclear weapons. Hanoi, especially after the recent big bombing raids, expects something of the kind. Moscow and Pekin are already trying to patch up their differences in expectation of it. If Nixon goes to nuclear weapons, the end result may well be World War III. Unless an army of students can fan out to the grass roots and make the country aware of these dangerous possibilities, terrible days may lie ahead. *Noon, May 12*

Herbert Hoover Had More Sense

President Nixon's statement Tuesday ("Frankly, if I had any money I'd be buying stocks right now.") brought to mind students of Wall Street crises a similar statement made by the aging John D. Rockefeller as the stock market was crashing during 1929. In what John Galbraith later reported was Rockefeller's first public statement in several decades, the financier said: "Believing that fundamental conditions of the country are sound . . . my son and I have for some days been purchasing sound common stocks." To which the popular comedian Eddie Cantor responded: "Sure, who else had any money?" President Herbert Hoover had been asked to state something encouraging about the failing market ("for example, that stocks were now cheap," according to Galbraith)—but he refused.

—*Financial Page*, Washington Post, *April 30.*

The 1969 Index Is Now Ready—You Can Have A Copy Free By Sending A LONG Self-Addressed Stamped Envelope For It

FOR STONE'S HIDDEN HISTORY

For the enclosed $7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, **The Hidden History of The Korean War** (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5/18/70

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED